

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2005, Claims 1-7, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujisaka et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,466,574). Applicants traverse the rejections and respectfully request reconsideration.

I. The Fujisaka Reference

The Fujisaka reference describes a system for reducing packet loss and delay by providing replicated data packet generation and transmission through the network. The packets are sent via different paths to reduce the probability of packet loss. Fujisaka indicates that the network in general provides connection via standard protocols, including IP, PPP, and LAN protocols. (See Fujisaka, col. 3 lines 48-50). Fujisaka describes the redundant packets may be created at the source computer (Fujisaka, col. 6, lines 43-44) or at a specialized network access point (Fujisaka, col. 14, lines 40-58). The multimedia interface 133 in the computers generate data that is provided to the packet replication process 500. The replicated data are provided to the standard network interface software 134, as shown in Figure 3.

The network interface is well known technology: "a standard well known network interface software 134, and a standard well known network connector 150 that in combination packetize the input to the media interface and transmit the packets in a protocol appropriate to the network 130 to which the computer 260 is connected 150." (Fujisaka, col. 6, lines 21-26).

II. The Claimed Invention

The presently claimed invention provides a method for supporting multiple PPP sessions between two entities in a soft handoff within a wireless communication environment. In such a situation, each PPP session carries redundant datagrams between the peers. That is, the redundant datagrams are associated with and transmitted by multiple PPP sessions. The invention provides for a method for utilizing multiple PPP sessions to provide data integrity assurance by discarding packets containing errors, while retaining the datagrams that are error free.

As recited in independent claims 1, 4 and 5, at least two PPP sessions are established for redundant transmission of datagrams. There are two management planes that effectively isolate the PPP protocol entities. A first management plane located on an upper layer of the PPP sessions, receives processed datagrams from the PPP sessions, compares the processed datagrams with each other to determine the processed datagrams having errors, selects an error free one of the processed datagrams, and transmits the selected processed datagram to the network layer. A second management plane located on a lower layer of the PPP sessions receives the datagrams, classifies the received datagrams, and transmits each of the received datagrams to the PPP session corresponding to the datagram, respectively.

III. Response to Rejections/Objections

Claims 1-7 are rejected under Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Fujisaka. Regarding claims 1 and 4, the Examiner states that Fujisaka teaches support of PPP. The

Examiner further states that the PPP sessions are between "source 131" and "destination 133" (See Office Action, page 2, lines 20-21).

The Applicants respectively traverse the Examiner's objections on a number of grounds. The Applicants submit that Fujisaka nowhere teaches establishing *multiple* PPP sessions for redundant data. Applicants respectfully assert that to the extent PPP sessions are used in Fujisaka, the PPP sessions would be between the computer 260 and the access point 140. Furthermore, this would involve only a single PPP session, not two as set forth in the pending claims 1 and 4. Because in Fujisaka's invention, only one PPP session would be necessary to connect the computer to the network, a general reference in Fujisaka indicating support for the prior art PPP protocol should not be confused with multiple PPP sessions of the Applicants' invention.

Even if the computer in Fujisaka had multiple network connections, each with a separate PPP session, Fujisaka does not disclose the multiple PPP processing as set forth in claims 1 and 4, nor the upper and lower management planes as set forth in claim 5.

In view of the argument set out above it is submitted that claims 1, 4, and 5, as now amended are allowable under 35 USC 102. It is submitted that claims 2-3 are allowable as being claims dependent upon an allowable claim, claim 1. It is further submitted that claims 6-7 are allowable as being claims dependent upon an allowable claim, claim 5.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicants submit that the application is in good and proper form for allowance and respectfully request the Examiner to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, at 312-913-3305.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Date: July 21, 2005

By:


Robert J. Irvine III
Registration No. 41,865